

US Appl. 10/776786
Reply to Action dated 2/23/2007
Page 4

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested. Claims 1, 6 and 8 are amended. The amendments are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 8, lines 1-8 and Figures 2 and 3. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6 and 8 remain pending.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al., (US 2001/0047896) in view of Putnam (US 5,288,094) or Belinky et al. (US 6,076,691) or Davis (US 6,447,302 B1).

The proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest a four-wheeled all terrain vehicle having a rear cowl extending from the right and left rear fenders, the rear cowl having a rearwardmost surface that is forward of rearwardmost points of the right and left rear wheels, and a vehicle where the vehicle can be stood upright with the right and left wheels and the rear end of the rear carrier in contact with the ground and with the rear cowl not in contact with the ground, and an accessory socket mounted on the cowl wherein when the vehicle is stood upright the accessory socket does not contact the ground.

Matsuura discloses a four-wheeled all terrain vehicle having a rear fender assembly 44, at least a portion of which projects beyond rearwardmost points of the rear wheels 16 as evident from Figure 2. The rear fender assembly 44 does not have a rearwardmost surface that is forward of rearwardmost points of the right and left rear wheels. This feature is likewise missing from Putnam, Belinky and Davis.

Nor do the cited references teach or suggest a vehicle that can be stood upright with the right and left wheels and the rear end of the rear carrier in contact with the ground and with the rear cowl not in contact with the ground, and an accessory socket mounted on the cowl wherein when the vehicle is stood upright the accessory socket does not contact the ground.

The office action asserts that if the ATV of Matsuura were stood upright, every component in the rear of the vehicle would be protected. Figure 2 of Matsuura clearly shows that the rear of the fender assembly 44 extends beyond the rear wheels 16. Therefore, if the ATV of Matsuura was stood upright with the right and left wheels and

US Appl. 10/776786
Reply to Action dated 2/23/2007
Page 5

the rear end of the rear carrier in contact with the ground, then it appears from Figure 2 that some portion of the fender assembly 44 would contact the ground. Whether or not the ATV of Matsuura could be stood upright as claimed, with the fender assembly 44 not in contact with the ground, is a matter of pure speculation and does not appear to be supported by Figure 2 of Matsuura.

Claim 8 recites that the socket is positioned in close proximity to one of the lamps. An advantage of this construction is that light from the lamp can illuminate the socket at night, making the lamp more visible. Matsuura does not teach such a feature. In addition to being from non-analogous art, Putnam, Belinky and Davis do not teach or suggest a socket that is in close proximity to a rear lamp.

For at least these reasons, the claims are patentable over Matsuura, Putnam, Belinky and Davis.

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: April 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre

Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/jal/tk